



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/564,988

01/18/2006

Yukuo Katayama

126599

7174

25944 7590 06/19/2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER

PO, MING CHEUNG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/19/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/564,988	Applicant(s) KATAYAMA, YUKUO	
	Examiner MING CHEUNG PO	Art Unit 1797	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MING CHEUNG PO. (3) ____.

(2) BENJAMIN PREBLEI. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 15 June 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-15.

Identification of prior art discussed: KAMEI (U.S. 4,702,745).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argues that 102 rejection of claims 1-7 is improper because the example in KAMEI that is referenced does not teach all the limitations. It appears to Examiner that the specific example referenced does not teach all the limitations. Applicant argued also that the screw in Figure 2 may not exert a shearing force. Examiner disagrees and stated that by inherent design of the screw in Figure 2, a shearing force would be applied.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Cephia D. Toomer/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797	Ming Cheung Po
---	----------------